

Comment on ‘Recombination induced softening and reheating of the cosmic plasma’

Wan Yan Wong^{*} and Douglas Scott[†]

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, 6224 Agricultural Rd., Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z1, Canada

2006 December

ABSTRACT

Leung, Chan & Chu (2004) claimed that a previously neglected reheating effect makes a small but noticeable change to the process of cosmological recombination. We revisit this effect by considering a system consisting of both radiation and ionizing gas under adiabatic expansion. In the thermal equilibrium limit, due to the huge radiation background, only a fraction about 10^{-10} of the heat released from the recombination of atoms is shared by the matter. And in the standard hydrogen recombination calculation, the maximum fraction of energy lost by the distortion photons through multiple Compton scattering is certainly $< 10^{-3}$. Thus this effect is negligible.

Key words: cosmology: cosmic microwave background – cosmology: early universe – cosmology: theory – atomic processes.

1 INTRODUCTION

Detailed calculations of the process through which the early Universe ceased to be a plasma are increasingly important because of the growing precision of microwave anisotropy experiments. The standard way to calculate the evolution of the matter temperature during the process of cosmological recombination is to consider the expansion of radiation and matter separately, and include the relevant interactions, specifically Compton scattering and photoionization cooling, as corrections (Peebles 1971, 1993; Seager, Sasselov & Scott 2000). The matter is treated as a perfect gas which is assumed to evolve adiabatically. Recently, Leung, Chan & Chu (2004) suggested that we need to use a generalized adiabatic index, since the gas was initially ionized and so the number of species (ion + electron vs atom) changes in the recombination process. In their derivation, they considered the effect of photoionization, recombination and excitation on the matter, but assumed that the matter was undergoing an adiabatic process. However, an adiabatic approximation for only the ionized matter is not valid in this case, because the change of entropy of the matter is not zero. Moreover, the photons released from the recombination of atoms mostly escape as free radiation, instead of reheating the matter, since the heat capacity of the radiation is much larger than that of the matter (see, for example, Peebles 1993; Seager, Sasselov & Scott 2000).

Here, we try to study this problem in a consistent way by considering both the radiation and ionizing hydrogen as

components in thermal equilibrium and under adiabatic expansion. This is not *exactly* the way things happened during recombination, but this will give us the maximum effect of the heat if it is all shared by the radiation and matter.

2 DISCUSSIONS

For simplicity, we consider that the matter consists only of hydrogen (including helium does not change the physical picture). By assuming that the radiation field and the matter are in thermal equilibrium, the total internal energy per unit mass of the system is

$$E = \frac{1}{n_{\text{H}} m_{\text{H}}} \left[aT^4 + \frac{3}{2}(n_{\text{H}} + n_{\text{e}})kT + n_{\text{p}}\epsilon_{\text{H, ion}} + \sum_i n_{\text{H},i}\epsilon_{\text{H},i} \right] \\ = \frac{1}{m_{\text{H}}} \left[\frac{aT^4}{n_{\text{H}}} + \frac{3}{2}(1 + x_{\text{e}})kT + x_{\text{p}}\epsilon_{\text{H, ion}} + \sum_i x_{\text{H},i}\epsilon_{\text{H},i} \right], \quad (1)$$

where $n_{\text{H},i}$ is the number density of neutral atoms in the i th state, n_{p} is the number density of protons, $n_{\text{H}} \equiv n_{\text{p}} + \sum_i n_{\text{H},i}$ is the total number density of neutral and ionized hydrogens, and n_{e} is the number density of electrons. Additionally $\epsilon_{\text{H, ion}}$ and $\epsilon_{\text{H},i}$ are the ionization energy for the ground state and the i th state of hydrogen, respectively, the x s are the fractional densities normalized by n_{H} , T is the temperature of the whole system, a is the radiation constant and k is Boltzmann’s constant.

In equation (1), the first term is the radiation energy, the second term is the kinetic energy of the matter, and the last two terms are the excitation energy of the atoms. Here the energy of the ground state is set to be equal to

^{*} E-mail: wanyan@phas.ubc.ca

[†] E-mail: dscott@phas.ubc.ca

zero (Mihalas & Mihalas 1984). No matter what energy reference is chosen, the change of energy should be the same, i.e.

$$dE = \frac{1}{m_H} \left[\frac{4aT^3}{n_H} dT - \frac{aT^4}{n_H^2} dn_H + \frac{3}{2}(1+x_e)k dT + \frac{3}{2}kT dx_e + \epsilon_{H, \text{ion}} dx_p + \sum_i \epsilon_{H,i} dx_{H,i} \right]. \quad (2)$$

We know that the radiation and matter are not *exactly* in thermal equilibrium (the two temperatures are not precisely the same) during the cosmological recombination of hydrogen, because the recombination rate is faster than the rate of expansion and cooling of the Universe. Nevertheless, the radiation background and matter are tightly coupled and it is a good approximation to treat the two as if they were in thermal equilibrium (e.g. Peebles 1971, p.232). This simple approach allows us to estimate how much of the heat released is shared with the radiation field and the matter during the recombination of hydrogen. In the expansion of the Universe, the whole system (radiation plus matter) is under an adiabatic process. However, this is not the case for the ionizing matter on its own, because the change of entropy of the matter is not zero. For an adiabatic process we have

$$dE = P \frac{d\rho}{\rho^2} \quad (3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{m_H} \left[(1+x_e)kT + \frac{1}{3} \frac{aT^4}{n_H} \right] \times \frac{3dz}{1+z}, \quad (4)$$

where P and ρ are the pressure and mass density of the system and z is redshift. By equating equations (2) and (4), we have

$$\frac{1+z}{T} \frac{dT}{dz} = \frac{3(1+x_e)kT + \frac{4aT^4}{n_H}}{\frac{3}{2}(1+x_e)kT + \frac{4aT^4}{n_H}} - \frac{1+z}{\frac{3}{2}(1+x_e)kT + \frac{4aT^4}{n_H}} \times \left[\frac{3}{2}kT \frac{dx_e}{dz} + \epsilon_{H, \text{ion}} \frac{dx_p}{dz} + \sum_i \epsilon_{H,i} \frac{dx_{H,i}}{dz} \right]. \quad (5)$$

In order to see whether we can ignore the radiation field, we need to compare the two terms in the denominator, i.e. the radiation energy and the kinetic energy of the matter. If the matter energy were much greater than the radiation energy, then we would have

$$\frac{1+z}{T} \frac{dT}{dz} \simeq 2 - \frac{1+z}{\frac{3}{2}(1+x_e)kT} \times \left[\frac{3}{2}kT \frac{dx_e}{dz} + \epsilon_{H, \text{ion}} \frac{dx_p}{dz} + \sum_i \epsilon_{H,i} \frac{dx_{H,i}}{dz} \right], \quad (6)$$

which is the result given by Leung, Chan & Chu (2004). However, in the current cosmological model with $T_0 = 2.725$, $Y_p = 0.24$, $h = 0.73$ and $\Omega_B = 0.04$ (e.g. Spergel et al. 2006), we have

$$\frac{E_{\text{matter}}}{E_{\text{radiation}}} \simeq \frac{n_H kT}{aT^4} = \frac{n_H 0k}{aT_0^3} \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-10}. \quad (7)$$

So, the radiation energy is *much* larger than both the kinetic energy of matter and also the total heat released during recombination. Hence, we definitely cannot ignore the radia-

tion field. In such a case, the second term in equation (5) is much smaller than the first term, because

$$\frac{(1+z)\epsilon_{H, \text{ion}}}{\frac{3}{2}(1+x_e)kT + \frac{4aT^4}{n_H}} \simeq \frac{(1+z)n_H \epsilon_{H, \text{ion}}}{aT^4} \sim 10^{-6}. \quad (8)$$

Hence the energy change due to the recombination process is taken up mostly by the radiation field, since there are many more photons than baryons. In other words, most of the extra photons (or heat) escape to the photon field, with just a very small portion ($\sim 10^{-10}$) reheating the matter. Therefore, the change of the temperature of the system can be approximated as

$$\frac{1+z}{T} \frac{dT}{dz} \simeq 1 \pm \delta, \quad (9)$$

where $\delta < 10^{-6}$. This gives us back the usual formula for the radiation temperature, which is consistent with the result that the matter temperature closely follows the radiation temperature (e.g. Peebles 1968; Seager, Sasselov & Scott 2000). Leung, Chan & Chu (2004) assumed that the extra heat is shared by the matter only, and hence that the second term of equation (6) is significant, because

$$\frac{(1+z)\epsilon_{H, \text{ion}}}{(1+x_e)kT} \simeq 6 \times 10^4. \quad (10)$$

By comparing this and the ratio given in equation (8), we can see that the factor is about 10 orders of magnitude larger if we ignore the radiation field. Another way to understand this overestimate is that the adiabatic approximation for matter *only* is not valid in their derivation, because the entropy of the matter is changing (i.e. $dS_{\text{matter}}/dz > 0$).

The Leung, Chan & Chu (2004) paper ignored the last term (the sum of the excitation energy terms) in equation (6), which physically means that there is a photon with energy equal to $\epsilon_{H, \text{ion}}$ ($\sim 13.6\text{eV}$) emitted when a proton and electron recombine, and the energy of this distortion photon is used up to heat the matter. This is actually not true for the recombination of hydrogen, since there is no direct recombination to the ground state (Peebles 1968; Zel'dovich, Kurt & Sunyaev 1968; Seager, Sasselov & Scott 2000) and there are about 5 photons per neutral hydrogen atom produced for each recombination (Chluba & Sunyaev 2006).

Note that what we calculate above is in the thermal equilibrium limit and it assumes that all the distortion photons are *thermalized* with the radiation background and the matter. However, in the standard recombination calculation, most of these distortion photons escape to infinity with tiny energy loss to the matter through Compton scattering. The maximum fraction of energy loss by the distortion photons after multiple scatterings ($\Delta E_\gamma/E_\gamma$) is very low (Switzer & Hirata 2005). An approximate estimate is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta E_\gamma}{E_\gamma} &\simeq \frac{\epsilon_{H, \text{ion}}}{m_e c^2} \tau \\ &\simeq \frac{13.6\text{eV}}{511\text{keV}} \times 30 \quad \text{at } z \simeq 1500, \text{ when } x_e \simeq 0.5 \\ &\simeq 8 \times 10^{-4}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where m_e is the mass of electron, c is the speed of light and

τ is the optical depth. Therefore, the $\epsilon_{\text{H, ion}} dx_{\text{p}}/dz$ term is in practise suppressed by at least 10^{-4} (since τ decreases when more neutral hydrogen atoms form at lower redshift). Hence, although there is *some* heating of the matter, the ratio of the heat shared by the matter and the radiation is very small, and the effect claimed by Leung, Chan & Chu (2004) is negligible for the recombination history and also for the microwave anisotropy power spectra.

3 CONCLUSION

By considering a simple model consisting of the radiation background and the ionizing gas under equilibrium adiabatic expansion, we show that the effect claimed by Leung, Chan & Chu (2004) is hugely overestimated. The appropriate method for calculating the matter temperature is to deal with Compton and Thomson scattering between the background photons, distortion photons and matter in detail. In general the Compton cooling time of the baryons off the CMB is very much shorter than the Hubble time until $z \sim 200$, hence it is extremely hard for any heating process to make the matter and radiation temperatures differ significantly at much earlier times.

4 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Jens Chluba and Henry Ling for very useful discussions. This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and a University of British Columbia Graduate Fellowship.

REFERENCES

- Chluba J., Sunyaev R.A., 2006, astro-ph/0608120
- Leung P.K., Chan C.W., Chu M.C., 2004, MNRAS, 349, 2, 632
- Mihalas D., Mihalas B.W., 1984, Foundations of Radiation Hydrodynamics, Oxford University Press, New York
- Peebles P.J.E. 1968, ApJ, 153, 1
- Peebles P.J.E., 1971, Physical Cosmology, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Peebles P.J.E., 1993, Principles of Physical Cosmology, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Seager S., Sasselov D.D., Scott D., 1999, ApJ, 523, L1
- Seager S., Sasselov D.D., Scott D., 2000, ApJS, 128, 407
- Spergel D.N., et al., 2006, astro-ph/0603449
- Switzer E.R., Hirata C.M., Phys. Rev. D 72, 8, 083002
- Zel’dovich Y.B., Kurt V.G., Sunyaev R.A., 1968, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz., 55, 278; English transl., 1969, Soviet Phys. JETP Lett., 28, 146

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.